

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/009,980	BENEDI BENITO ET AL.
	Examiner Teresa E. Strzelecka	Art Unit 1637

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Teresa E. Strzelecka.

(3) _____.

(2) Edward Gamson.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 August 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

18

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Teresa Strzelecka

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/009,980	BENEDI BENITO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Teresa E. Strzelecka	1637

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Teresa E. Strzelecka.

(3) _____.

(2) Edward Gamson.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 September 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

18

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Mr. Gamson received an approval from the Applicants for the proposed changes to claim 18, which will be introduced by Examiner's amendment, putting the application in condition for allowance.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Teresa Strzelecka

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gamson was contacted to discuss patentability of the amended claim 18.. The last step of the claim is drawn to amplification of extracted gum DNA using one or more primers of SEQ ID NO: 4, SEQ ID NO: 6, a portion of SEQ ID NO: 7 or a portion of SEQ ID NO:9. As evidenced by sequence search, SEQ ID NO: 4 is not specific to guar plants, as are most of the fragments of SEQ ID NO: 7 and 9. The only primers specific for guar rRNA amplification are primers with SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6, denoted as PG21 and PG22 in Fig. 1A. Therefore, for claim 18 to be allowable it would need to be drawn to primers comprising SEQ ID NO: 5 and 6. Another issue with claim 18 is lack of correspondence between the preamble and the final method step. Mr. Gamson said he would contact the Applicants to find out if they agreed to the proposed amendments. .